

PRABUDDHA BHARATA

Vol. III.

DECEMBER, 1898.

No. 5.

(INTERVIEW WITH SWAMI VIVEKANANDA: ON INDIAN WOMEN—THEIR PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE.

It was early one Sunday morning, (writes our representative) in a beautiful Himalayan valley, that I was at last able to carry out the order of the Editor, and call on the Swami Vivekananda, to ascertain something of his views on the position and prospects of Indian Women.)

“ Let us go for a walk ”, said the Swami, when I had announced my errand, and we set out at once amongst some of the most lovely sceneries in the world.

By sunny and shady ways we went, through quiet villages, amongst playing children, and across the golden cornfields. Here the tall trees seemed to pierce the blue above, and there a group of peasant girls stooped, sickle in hand, to cut and carry off the plume-tipped stalks of maize-straw for the winter stores. Now the road led into an apple orchard, where great heaps of crimson fruit lay under the trees being picked and sorted, and again we were out in the open, facing the snows that rose in august beauty above the white clouds against the sky.

At last my companion broke the silence. “ The Aryan and Semitic ideals of woman,” he said, “ have always been diametrically opposed. Amongst the Semites the presence of woman is considered dangerous to devotion, and she may not perform any

religious function, even such as killing of a bird for food : according to the Aryan, a man cannot perform a religious action without a wife.” ७

“ But Swamiji ! ” said I,—startled at an assertion so sweeping and so unexpected—“ Is Hinduism not an Aryan faith ? ”

“ Modern Hinduism,” said the Swami quietly, “ is largely Pauranic, that is, post Buddhistic in origin. Dayananda Saraswati pointed out that though a wife is absolutely necessary in the sacrifice of the domestic fire, which is a Vedic rite, she may not touch the Shalgram Shila, or the household-idol, because that dates from the later period of the Puranas.”

“ And so you consider the inequality of woman amongst us as entirely due to the influence of Buddhism ? ”

“ Where it exists, certainly,” said the Swami, “ but we should not allow the sudden influx of European criticism, and our consequent sense of contrast, to make us acquiesce too readily in this notion of the inequality of our women. Circumstances have forced upon us, for many centuries, the woman’s need of protection. This, and not her inferiority, is the true reading of our customs.”

“ Are you, then entirely satisfied with the position of woman amongst us, Swamiji ? ”

“ By no means,” said the Swami, “ but our right of interference is limited entirely to giving education. Women must be put in a position to solve their own problems in their own way. No one can or ought to do this for them. And our Indian women are as capable of doing it as any in the world.”

“ How do you account for the evil influence which you attribute to Buddhism ? ”

“ It only came with the decay of the faith,” said the Swamiji.—“ Every movement triumphs by dint of some unusual

characteristic, and when it falls, that point of pride becomes its chief element of weakness. The Lord Buddha—greatest of men—was a marvellous organiser, and carried the world by this means. But his religion was the religion of a monastic order. It had, therefore, the evil effect of making the very robe of the monk honoured. He also introduced for the first time the community-life of religious houses, and thereby necessarily made women inferior to men, since the great abbesses could take no important step without the advice of certain abbots. It ensured its immediate object, the solidarity of the faith, you see, only its far-reaching effects are to be deplored.”

“ But Sannyas is recognised in the Vedas ! ”

“ Of course it is, but without making any distinction between men and women. Do you remember how Yajnavalkya was questioned at the Court of King Janaka ? His principal examiner was Vachaknavi, the maiden orator—Brahmavadini, as the word of the day was. “ Like two shining arrows in the hand of the skilled archer,” she says, “ are my questions. ” Her sex is not even commented upon.

(Again, could anything be more complete than the equality of boys and girls in our old forest universities ? . Read our Sanskrit dramas—read the story of Shakuntala, and see if Tennyson’s “ Princess ” has anything to teach us ! ”

“ You have a wonderful way of revealing the glories of our past, Swamiji ! ”

“ Perhaps, because I have seen both sides of the world,” said the Swami gently, “ and I know that the race that produced Sita—even if it only dreamt of her—has a reverence for woman that is unmatched on the earth. There is many a burden bound with legal tightness on the shoulders of Western women that is utterly unknown to ours. We have our wrongs and our exceptions certainly, but so have they. We must never forget that all over

the globe the general effort is to express love and tenderness and uprightness, and that national customs are only the nearest vehicles of this expression. With regard to the domestic virtues I have no hesitation in saying that our Indian methods have in many ways the advantage over all others."

("Then have our women any problems at all, Swamiji ? "

"Of course, they have many and grave problems, but none that are not to be solved by that magic word "Education." The true education, however, is not yet conceived of amongst us."

"And how would you define that ? "

"I never define anything," said the Swami smiling, "still, it may be described as a development of faculty, not an accumulation of words, or as a training of individuals to will rightly and efficiently. So shall we bring to the need of India great fearless women—women, worthy to continue the traditions of Sangamita, Lila, Ahalya Bai, and Mira Bai. Women fit to be mothers of heroes, because they are pure and selfless and strong, with the strength that comes of touching the feet of God.

"So you consider that there should be a religious element in education. Swamiji ? "

"I look upon Religion as the innermost core of education," said the Swami solemnly.—"Mind, I do not mean my own, or any one else's, opinion about Religion. I think the teacher should take the pupil's starting-point in this, as in other respects, and enable her to develop along her own line of least resistance."

"But surely the religious exaltation of Brahmacharya, by taking the highest place from the mother and wife, and giving it to those who evade those relations, is a direct blow dealt at Woman ?"

"You should remember," said the Swami, "that if Religion exalts Brahmacharya for woman, it does exactly the same for man. Moreover, your question shows a certain confusion in your own mind. Hinduism indicates one duty, only one, for the human soul. It is to seek to realise the permanent amid the evanescent. No

one presumes to point out any one way in which this may be done. Marriage or non-marriage, good or evil, learning or ignorance, any of these is justified, if it leads to the Goal. In this respect lies the great contrast between it and Buddhism, for the latter's outstanding direction is to realise the Impermanence of the External, which, broadly speaking, can only be done in one way. Do you recall the story of the young yogi in the Mahabharata, who prided himself on his psychic powers by burning the bodies of a crow and crane, by his intense will produced by anger? Do you remember the young saint went into the town, and found first a wife nursing her sick husband, and then the butcher Dharmabyadha, both of whom had obtained enlightenment in the path of common faithfulness and duty?"

"And so what would you say, Swâmi, to the women of this country?"

"Why to the women of this country," said the Swâmi, "I would say exactly what I say to the men. Believe in India, and in our Indian faith. Be strong and hopeful and unashamed, and remember that with something to take, Hindus have immeasurably more to give than any other people in the world."

—:—

ONLY A VISION

It was evening. The rays of the setting sun were turning into gold and purple the burnished silver peaks of the mighty Himalaya, and the girdle of eternal snows which the goddess of the northern regions wears around her stately form, shone out with a radiant virgin purity as far as the enchanted sight could follow. A belt of white greyish cloud fondly floated around the waist of Nandadevi, and an oblique ray lighted up her summit with a supramundane golden tinge, while the deep blue sky, above and beyond, formed a fitting background for the display of this divine combination of shapes and hues. In the air around there was floating a song which my ears had been drinking in for some little time past: but when it

came to the part,

चाम्पेय गौराङ्ग शरीरकायै कर्पूर गौराङ्ग शरीरकाय ।
धम्मिल्यवत्स्यै च जटाधराय नमः शिवायै च नमः शिवाय ॥

[Adoration to the blended form of Shiva and Shiva, which has on one half of it, the fair golden colour of the champaka flower, and on the other the white of camphor, one half of which is adorned with braided and ornamented hair, and the other with matted locks]; a cool scented breeze which appeared to take its rise from the spot where the gold shaded into the silver of Nandadevi's majestic peak softly touched my forehead, and my senses suddenly left me.—I was left in a state I know not how to describe; but the sweet rhythmical flow of the song was no longer there.

* * * * *

Presently a sound filled the space—melodious, but so calm and gentle and full of peace, that even the flow of blood and the throb of the heart seemed to get quieted down and ceased from action altogether, infected, by the absence of friction which was in the atmosphere. The sound appeared to be nothing else than the following verses of the Gita:—

समं सर्वेषु भूतेषु तिष्ठन्तं परमेश्वरम् ।
विनश्यत्स्व विनश्यन्तं यः पश्यति स पश्यति ॥
समं पश्यन् हि सर्वत्र समवस्थितमीश्वरम् ।
न हिनस्त्यात्मनात्मानं ततोयाति परां गतिम् ॥

[He that sees the supreme Lord residing uniformly in all objects, deathless among the dying, sees aright. And looking upon all things as uniformly pervaded by the Lord, he does not try to injure self by self and thus attains to the highest goal.]

And it filled every direction of the infinite space.

While the vibration was growing every moment in power and intensity of harmony, a scene was stretched out before my eyes. It was that of a narrow crowded street, having on both sides of it unshapely

Ill-arranged stonehouses of all sorts and heights, with temples dotted about in great numbers. The luminous form of a young man in ochre clothes, with head and face faultlessly shaved, and followed by a number of men of varying ages dressed in the same garb passed by,—and as my eyes, struck by the majestic and unique appearance of the youth, were unconsciously following him, I beheld a stout, burly, middle-aged man, of a dirty, untidy exterior, advancing from the opposite direction, eyeing the world around him with the supremest indifference, and closely followed by four powerful, fierce-looking dogs. At his sight, every passer-by hastily made for the opposite side of the street, lest he should be defiled by the unholy touch of the shadow of the chandala, but the young Sanyasin upon coming up, instead of standing by and letting the chandala pass, ordered him to move away with his dogs to one side of the street. At this the chandala halted, and looking straight in the Sanyasin's face, asked him in a voice of thunder, the reason why he should do so. "Was the sheath built of food, which covered him," spoke the chandala, "different in any way from the composition and structure of that which covered the Sanyasin? Was the Sanyasin's sheath of vital airs any way distinct from his? Was the sheath of mind or that of intellect dissimilar in two human beings? Or did the blissful-sheath and the All-pervader beyond it, admit of any specification and distinction? Was the Sanyasin cognisant of the Vedic teachings about the Self, or was he a fraud and hypocrite parading the streets in yellow garb to cheat householders and live upon them"?—The young Sanyasin was startled and was mumbling out an abject apology, when behold! the chandala and his dogs were no longer visible, but in their place stood the glorious form of Vishvanatha with the four Vedas personified around him!

* * * * *

My whole being was merged in the sweetest astonishment as I witnessed this strange scene. In an instant the whole meaning of the vision flashed into my mind. The intense harmony of the all-pervading music

of the shlokas of the Gita had not passed away, when lo ! a flagrant breach was perpetrated, and again made whole !

The majestic song rolled on, swelling in power and grandeur and deepening in intensity every moment, filling the universe with light and sweetness. But it was not to endure. For presently another vision unfolded before my surprised gaze, the unnatural absurdity and inharmony of which chased-away the divine melody of the world-music from the reach of my hearing. The scene was laid about the country where the same Saayasin whom I saw in the preceding vision was born. I saw, strange to relate, a man of noble progeny, but of humble heart and mean exterior forcibly ejected by a number of persons in no way different from him—except indeed in the possession of inhuman hearts,—and persecuted for venturing *to walk through a certain street* ! Astonished, I carefully scrutinized the sufferer expecting to discover in him some fell disease abhorred by the human race. But no ! while men suffering from terrible physical and moral maladies, breathing poisonous infection wherever they went, had free access everywhere, some poor and weak brothers, because of their helplessness, were made the prey of the meanest human passion. And curious to say, that if these same downtrodden men, assumed in pain and anguish a vesture of feelings and aspirations around their heart, foreign to their nature and to their motherland, they were no longer treated as *inferiors*, but more often as *superiors*. For I found the same person, who was refused permission to walk through a street,—as soon as he had put a foreign cloak around him—was welcomed home, and given a seat of honour, by his former persecutors.

Was this to be the result of the lesson taught to the Saayasin by the Lord ?—

I wondered !

* * * * *

Yet another sight was in store for me, as if the necessary reaction in *relative Nature* of the sweet music which flooded my whole being with

peace a little while ago, but was now lingering in memory alone. It was in a part of Bharata where vigour and manliness pervaded the atmosphere. On a broad sheet of clear water floated a golden temple, forcibly recalling to the mind the analogy of love reigning supreme in a spotless and self-controlled mind. Holy men of all descriptions, had their quarters about the sacred place, and the atmosphere of spirituality was sought to be constantly preserved by various religious performances—the mightiest of which was the reading of the ever holy Granth. Tall, powerfully-built, handsome looking men, with masses of long hair tied on the head in a peculiar manner under large white turbans, could be seen gathering at the temple and at each place where the holy scripture was being read. The spirit of calm reverence was in the air, but like the sting of a deadly worm hidden in the soft fragrance of a flower, arose these words from one of the biggest assemblies, directed by one in authority to a new comer, “Good sir, there is no seat for your caste people here, please begone.” Stung to the quick, the noble and brave warrior hung down his head, and shedding tears of blood left the holy place of his forefathers—the sanctuary of the Spirit which is one without a second, undifferentiated and pervading all, with but one characteristic which it has, *viz.*, sameness.

The next day, at the same place and at the same hour a different scene was enacted. The man who was turned out the previous day entered the premises again with bold and firm steps; the hint to leave was given, as usual, but the soldier had come prepared this time—“I am no longer the man” cried he, with flashing eyes, “whom you turned away yester-day. Look here, the knot of the Guru is no more on my head. That religion of my forefathers which made me the mark of your hatred I have spurned,—I am a Mussulman now !”

A dead silence came over the place,—but that was all !

* * * * *

Perhaps I had had enough of these sights, for presently I awoke to the sense-world, but the glory of the painted heavens was gone, and the snow

ranges though visible, appeared to have moved far away, and wore a misty greyish look about them! I pondered wonderingly on the lessons which the visions taught me. It seemed to me as if I had got a clue to the cause of the demoralisation of the Indian character, and so, to that of the downfall of the motherland itself. Our theories we never practise. Hypocrisy would not be the exact name for this mental attitude, but on analysis it looks dangerously like it. We have got our splendid theory of

सर्वं ब्रह्ममयं जगत्

(All this universe is Brahman), we say

त्व स्त्री त्वं पुमानसि त्वं कुमार उत्तमा कुमारी ।

त्वं जीर्णो दण्डेन वञ्चसि त्वं जाती भवसि विश्वती मुखः ॥

(It is *you* who appear as woman and it is *you* who appear as man. It is *you* who appear as bachelor and it is *you* who appear as maid. It is *you* again who as the old walk with the help of a stick, and it is *you* who is born as the manifold creation), and we fully believe in what we say; but somehow or other, it so happens that we do not care to reduce into practice that very thing which it is the ambition every moment of our lives to realize. To rend asunder the veil of Mâyâ is the point of consummation of our wishes and we are perfectly sure about it; but we would not take up the knife and give it a thrust, by making our intellect—which is trained enough for the purpose—behave, and our body act, as if all this were really Brahman.

X.

ISLAM :

A MIGHTY TESTIMONY TO VEDANTISM.

(Continued from page 25).

(8 b.) AND giving away ?

“ Lan'tānālulbirra, hatta tunfiqoo, minma'tuhibboon.” You will not attain unto righteousness unless you give away what you love (or care for in the least).

9. What does the “ Fully Enlightened command ” ?

Yāmoro kum, bil-adh wal ihsān, wa cetāi zil qurba. wa yanha

'anil fahshá-i-wal munkari wal baghyi, ya 'izakum la'alla kum tatta-qoon "

He teaches you *equality*, *condescension* and *charity* and forbids objectionable things. He teaches you these, in order that you should become straight, *i.e.*, harmonised, perfected.

" Wa yozakkee him anfasahum ," and he cleanses their hearts, purifies the mind, inaugurates true Yoga.

10. What does the Gurn, or the spiritual guide command ?

" Mootoo qabla an tamootoo. " Die before you die—*i.* kill your baser self, *i. e.*, control your desires, regulate your mind, senses and body and kill *that* which keeps you from so regulating them. " Ya bunaiyya fikroka feeka yakfeeka, da uu wa dawánn feeka, anta jismun sagheerun wa feeka 'álamun kabeerun, anta ummul ki tal. " O my son, thine own meditation within thyself is quite sufficient for thee: both the disease and the remedy are within thine ownself; thou art a small body, but within thee there is a large region. Thou art the mother of books, *i. e.*, learning or knowledge.

Based on the spirit or gist of what has been very briefly and perhaps roughly described above, the theories of " Islam, " so far as they can be clothed in words by the humble writer of this essay, can be summarised as follows; (1) that there is a self-existing *something*, a perfect whole, " A lasto bi rabbi kum, qá loo bala "—Am I not your God. They answered " yes " — " Inney anallah " —I am Allah, all or self. " Howalla hullazee La ila ha illa hoo " He is such that there is none but *He*. (2) That, that self-existing *something* is manifested in *every thing* visible, conceivable &c. That, that perfect *whole* is *wholly* manifested. " Alla ho noorus—sama wati wal ard "—God is the Light of heavens and Earths, *i. e.*, every thing is His manifestation. " Howal awwalo wal akhiro, wazzáhiro wal hátin '—He is the Beginning, He is the Ending, He is the Evolution—He is the Involution—(Is that not pure Vedanta ? See Swami Vivekananda's " Macrocosm and Microcosm "). But for that *involved* and self-existing *something*, nothing evolved and apparent could have been visible, conceivable, and so on. (3) That *every thing* which is thus the manifestation of that *something* can realize that *something*. " Wa ma Khalaqtul jilna wal nisa illa liya bodeen (liya'r-i-foon) —All are to know, to realize. (4.) That the perfect state of realization is the complete absence of the conceivable difference of *Everything* and *Something*, *i. e.*, realization of a

perfect whole: — “Wa yabqá wajho rabbika,” and shall only remain the *audience* of Light.

Guided by these theories, the practical instructions in the dualistic school of thought in Islam begin thus.

(1) That there is one Spiritual Being, Maker, Preserver and Destroyer of every thing, “Inna Lilla hi wa inna elaihi rajioon.” Surely we are from Him and unto Him shall we return. That the soul or spirit is like a mirror wherein *He* is reflected,—“Wa izá ardual amánata ’a lassum a wati, wal ardi, fa a baina aiyá ya’ h uilna ha, wa hamala hal iusan.” And when We offered Our *Trust* to Heavens and Earths, they declined to take it up, but *man* took it up, i. e. man is perfectly blessed with that Trust—which is all *Light*.

That actions regulate *life*—“In Ahsantum Ahsantum li an fosikum, wa in a satum fa la ha”. If you do good, it is for yourself—and if you do wrong it is also for yourself—“Man ih tada, fa innama yah tadi li na fsih, wa man dalla, fa in nana ya dilko ’alai ha”—Whosoever took the right path, he certainly did good to himself—and whosoever took the wrong path, he certainly did wrong to himself.

This more or less represents the Karma Yoga of Islam—or the most elementary teachings for the mass. Appropriate and exhaustive instructions to guide and regulate *actions*, are laid down in religious books and the Professors of Islam are required to conform to them in their own interest, as well as in the interest of Humanity. *Prayer, charity, fellow-feeling, and purity* of thought and action, have been encouraged in various ways—full practical instructions to guide all, are laid down and to go by them is ordinarily considered to be very safe and sure. Similarly *absence* (as opposed to prayer) *selfishness, pride* and all *impurities* are discouraged and legislated for. Once thus disciplined, one at once stands on a vantage-ground, quite capable of receiving *finer* instructions as to “Self”—which is the aim—the *goal*. In Islam, primarily, very great importance has been attached to this *disciplining*. Control of body, control of senses and last, though not least, control of mind, have been throughout regarded as the first fruits and blessings of Existence, and have been very earnestly offered to Mankind by means of definite, easy and natural practical instructions. This is what is generally understood by the Sharee’at of Islam.—(*To be concluded.*)

MOHOMEDANANDA

EDITORIAL SECTION.

GOOD AND EVIL.

It is one of the principal features of all dualistic systems of religion to exult and glory in strife and victory: for the question of good and evil is not solved by this line of thought. When the greatest carnage is wrought in the camp of what is supposed to be the evil, the highest harmony is believed to be secured. The evil can never be the good—so that utter destruction of evil is held to be the only means of improvement: consequently if any other conception, any other 'way out' is met with anywhere it is greeted with derision. Thus we find in one of the best English magazines, a distinguished oriental scholar writing a few years back in the following strain: "The 330,000,000 gods of the Hindu Pantheon are balanced by a Pandemonium of equally numerous proportion. But in the Hindu system the gods are often worsted in their conflicts with their foes. And, what is still more remarkable, the demons of Hinduism are not necessarily irreligious. They may acquire more than divine power by the practice of religious austerities. Thus the demon Ravana is described as having compelled all the secondary gods to do menial work in his service."

The trend of Hindu religious thought may be discovered by this one instance of its ungrudgingly assigning to evil a higher position than good. This not only shows plainly enough its point of view of the good-and-evil question but the greater question of the ultimate reality—the 'first principles of being' according to it—is also made manifest. There is no evil, says Hinduism. What looks like evil is only good in embryo—growing, but not yet fullgrown—out of which something is required which it cannot as yet yield; hence, it is hastily stigmatized as evil. Dirt is matter in the wrong place, they say. Since the discovery of 'X' rays our theory of darkness—so completely lending itself to analogy with evil—has changed altogether. It has been found that 'X' rays can be had in abundance in darkness, and the time is at hand when the energy of darkness will be called upon to make light. Quite in the same manner, evil might be transformed into good if it is recognised that the difference between them is not one of *kind* but that of *degree* only.

The demons of Hinduism therefore, could not necessarily be irreligious

or, shut out from the paths of knowledge and power. Even among those imperfections, which secure for them the name by which they are called, even working under such adverse conditions, many of them have grown up to be the greatest sages and lovers of the Lord, Who is All-Love and All-Harmony. And why ? Because the Law is for growth and perfection. And as the Law is universal, not even the minutest atom could be supposed to be left behind in the dark for a long time.

Hinduism which is essentially monistic, as this its non-distinction (for all intents and purposes) between good and evil alone shows—and so in perfect agreement with the latest knowledge gathered by Modern Science in her laborious searchings in the garden of Nature about the ultimate nature of things, thus stands out alone with her unique wisdom older than the ages, in a peculiar glory of her own among the religions.

But it is a queer irony of fate that truth should be more often railed at than its imperfect brother.

WHAT IS THE NEW PANTHEISM.

(Continued from page 64.)

Then we have “doctrinal pantheism”—“the worship of Nature and humanity founded on the doctrine that the entire phenomenal universe, including man and Nature, is the ever-changing manifestation of God, who rises to personality and self-consciousness only in man.”

Still another division is termed “realistic pantheism”—“the deification of natural causes, conceived as one personified Nature, to which the religious sentiment is directed.

Of course we find here room for a wide range of pantheistic conceptions,—a range as wide as the varying conceptions of what may constitute “natural causes.” If matter is looked upon as the “natural cause” of things, or of phenomena, the universe of matter would be the subject or object of deification. If mind is regarded as the natural cause, then the universe of mind would be the object of deification. “Pantheism,” says one writer, when explained to mean the absorption of God in Nature, is atheism, and the doctrine of Spinoza has been so regarded by many. When explained to mean the absorption of Nature in God, . . . of the finite in

the infinite . . . it amounts to an exaggeration of theism: "

In still another division we have "philosophical pantheism," and it is defined as: "The form of monism that identifies mind and matter, the finite and the infinite, making them manifestations of one universal or absolute being. It has three generic forms, with variations; one substance pantheism, which ascribes to the universal being the attributes of both mind and matter, thought and extension, as in Spinoza's system; materialistic pantheism, which ascribes to it only the attributes of matter as in the system of Strauss; idealistic pantheism, which ascribes to it only the attributes of mind, as in Hegel's system. The last two, in certain varieties, may be regarded as sinking all in Nature and man respectively; a variety that sinks all in God might be termed hypertheism. "

Dr. A. A. Hodge, in his outlines of theology, says: "Pantheism . . . is absolute monism maintaining that the entire phenomenal universe is the everchanging existence-form of the one universal substance, which is God. Thus God is all, and all is God. " Another name for philosophical pantheism, and a better name, would be cosmotheism.

It will be noted here that one writer says that Spinoza's system is looked upon, by many, as being atheistic; while this writer seems to regard it as hypertheism. Such a definition as the above of Hegel's system is very inadequate, of course especially in so far as it relates to that form of pantheistic idealism which is to-day known as monistic idealism, and out of which is evolved a conception of an Absolute Personality, or an "Absolute Experience," according to Prof. Royce and others.

Pantheism, as defined by still another accepted authority, is "the doctrine that the universe, taken or conceived of as a whole, is God; the doctrine that there is no God but the combined forces and laws which are manifested in the existing universe." This definition comes nearer being, what is popularly understood to be comprehended by the term under consideration, but from a historical point of view does not seem to be sufficiently adequate. The element of personality, or the instinct of personification, which runs back to the very beginning, is entirely overlooked, at least, is unexpressed.

Finite personality inherently craves, and at every moment of the deepest life, instinctively cries out for the touch of an infinite, or, at least, a larger personality. This element in humanity is so deep seated, so universal, so innate that it is impossible for me to conceive that one-half, or more, of the human race could possibly have lived, and, to-day, continue to live, under a religion or a philosophy that does not contain something which answers to it in a satisfying manner. After a considerable

study of the matter. I am convinced that the popular mind, here in the West, has misunderstood our Oriental friends in regard to this point. How can the instinct of personification, which runs back to the very beginning, be accounted for if the germ, at least, of theistic personality, or of that which we denominate as infinite personality and infinite consciousness, was not inherent in the system? The western prejudice against the term pantheism is, I imagine, largely the outgrowth of what may be called theological, or philosophical partisanship, rather than of a fair understanding of what the word stands for.

The Mosiac, the Christian, and the Mohammedan religions are classed as distinctively theistic; all the other religions of the world are classed as pantheistic. But deeper than these superficial lines of distinction, lie the common bonds of humanity. And essential humanity is not so very different anywhere, or at any age.

It has seemed to me that these two great divisions in the world's religions—the theistic and the pantheistic, as they are generally denominated—might be rationally regarded as representative of the two great divisions in the world of organic life, namely, that of male and female, or that of the masculine and feminine elements. The historic aggressiveness—to put it in the mildest terms the facts will admit—of the theistic religions is finely illustrative of the male element common to all organic life, especially in its cruder forms of development. While on the other hand, the contemplative, the introspective, the intuitive aspect of primitive pantheism, we recognize as far more characteristic of the feminine element in, not only human, but organic life generally.

I do not care to go into this matter in any detail whatever. I wish simply to call attention to it, in passing, and to suggest that if it is true that the ideal human being is one who combines, in due proportions, both of these elements, then I should venture to suggest that the ideal religion would embody and express a union of the theistic conception of the infinite fatherhood of God with that of the pantheistic idea of the infinite motherhood of God, or of Nature. And I suspect that if the time ever comes when Christianity becomes the Christianity of the real Christ, it will be found that he, in his own person and spirit, did stand for just this union. The fourth gospel would alone be a basis sufficient for such a claim, were there nothing else; but his sayings and parables, as recorded, are full of insight into and sympathy with Nature, to say nothing of those recently discovered "sayings," about which so much has already been said in the press and elsewhere: "Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood and there am I." Did he not, as has been said, "make his followers feel that the heart-throb of Nature, was that which beat in his own breast"?—[*To be concluded.*]

DR. C. T. STOCKWELL.